

**REMARKS:**

Claims 1-19 were pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 8-10, and 15-17 have been amended, and claims 4-7, 11-14, and 18-19 have been cancelled. Claims 20-101 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-3, 8-10, 15-17, and 20-101 are now pending in this application.

**Double Patenting Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-19 for obviousness-type double patenting based on U.S. Patent No. 6,745,201. Although Applicant does not necessarily agree that this rejection is warranted, Applicant has nevertheless submitted a terminal disclaimer relative to the '201 Patent to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, these rejections are believed moot.

**Section 102 Rejections**

The Examiner rejected independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 based on U.S. Patent No. 6,816,175 to Hamp, et al. Applicant traverses this rejection. Applicant submits that Hamp does not anticipate claim 1 as Hamp does not teach each and every limitation of that claim. Specifically, Hamp does not teach or suggest “generating a context list of a first plurality of contexts within said information hierarchy that include one or more nodes that reference the first node,” as recited in claim 1.

While Hamp discloses a “computer system for navigation within a tree-structure,” Hamp, col. 4, lines 14-15, that reference does not teach or suggest “generating a context list” of the type recited in amended claim 1, specifically a “context list” of “contexts” “that include one or more nodes that reference the first node.” The Examiner cited col. 8, line 63 through col. 9, line 51 and col. 11, lines 9-64 of Hamp as teaching the pre-amended version of limitation (b). Applicant has reviewed these passages, and submits that neither teaches or suggests “generating a context list” as recited in claim 1.

The portion of the detailed description beginning at col. 8, line 63 (“4.2.1 Navigation by Selecting an Entry Point”) refers to “[c]licking on any attribute in the attribute list,” which “triggers” a number of “activities,” including “determin[ing]” “those non-leaf nodes, which are the direct parent nodes of leaf nodes associated with said selected object attribute.” Hamp, col.

8, lines 64, 65, and col. 9, lines 1-3. In other words, this passage deals with “determin[ing] ... nodes ...associated with said selected object attribute,” not “generating a context list” of “contexts” “that include one or more nodes that reference the first node,” as recited in claim 1. Similarly, the passage at col. 11, lines 9-64, is directed to an “attribute list object” that “contains all values that occur for the attribute that is used to select the clusters to be displayed.” Thus, this passage is concerned with “attributes,” not generation of a “context list” of the type recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant requests removal of these rejections.


**CONCLUSION:**

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6057-06901/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 26, 2007

By:   
Dean M. Munyon  
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.  
P. O. Box 398  
Austin, Texas 78767  
(512) 853-8847